

Remarks

Claims 1-9 and 11-16 are now pending in this application. Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 4, 9, and 11, added claim 16, and cancelled claim 10 to clarify the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

The Examiner objected to the specification as not describing a computer readable medium. Applicants respectfully point out that the specification describes a computer readable medium at page 4, lines 18-22. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the specification.

The Examiner objected to claims 1-15. Applicants have amended the claims to address the issues identified by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the claims.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicants have amended the claims along the lines suggested by the Examiner. Applicants submit that the claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The Examiner rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Claim 10 is no longer pending. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-12, 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the pages 6-7 of the specification (referred to as AAPA) in view of the Varadarajan et al. article. The Examiner rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Varadarajan et al. and further in view of U.S. patent 6,640,140 to Lindner et al.

The combination of AAPA and Varadarajan et al. does not suggest the claimed invention since, among other things, the combination does not suggest a method for enabling access to a function of a real world object represented as an aspect object in a control system through a network such as the internet or an intranet utilizing a web client application in a client device external to the control system. A representation of the aspect object and aspects associated with the aspect object are downloaded from the control system. A representation of an aspect category and an aspect type are downloaded from the control system to the client device. A representation of an aspect system object is downloaded to the client device hosting the web client application, wherein a function of the real world object is enabled for access.

On the other hand, AAPA requires software, such as dynamic link libraries to be preinstalled in the client devices. AAPA also does not suggest how to resolve access to an aspect of an aspect object utilizing internet technology. These represent significant differences with the claimed invention, which utilizes a web client application, such as a web browser. Even if Varadarajan et al. were to suggest overcoming differences between the claimed invention and AAPA, modifying AAPA to result in the claimed invention would be contrary to AAPA and would only be possible through hindsight.

Accordingly, the combination of AAPA and Varadarajan et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claims 1-12, 14 and 15. Therefore, the invention recited in claims 1-12, 14 and 15 is not obvious in view of the combination of AAPA and Varadarajan et al. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The combination of AAPA, Varadarajan et al. and Lindner et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claim 13 since, among other things, Lindner et al. does not overcome the above-described deficiencies of AAPA or Varadarajan et al. Along these lines, Lindner et al. does not suggest enabling access to a function of a real world object represented as an aspect object in a control system through a network such as the internet or an intranet utilizing a web client application in a client device external to the control system.

In view of the above, the combination of AAPA, Varadarajan et al. and Lindner et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claim 13. It follows that the invention recited in claim 13 is not obvious in view of the combination of AAPA, Varadarajan et al. and Lindner et al. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

In view of the above, the references relied upon in the office action do suggest patentable features of the claimed invention. Therefore, the references relied upon in the office action do not make the claimed invention obvious. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the claimed invention is patentable over the cited references and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections based on the cited references.

If an interview would advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants respectfully urge the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge fee insufficiency and credit overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 22-0261.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 10, 2009

/Eric J. Franklin/
Eric J. Franklin, Reg. No. 37,134
Attorney for Applicant
Venable LLP
575 Seventh Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004
Telephone: 202-344-4936
Facsimile: 202-344-8300